

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring,
Apprehending, Registering and Tracking



The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering and Tracking](#) (SMART), is pleased to announce that it is seeking applications for funding under the SMART Office FY 16 Promoting Evidence Integration in Sex Offender Management: Development and Implementation of Sex Offender Treatment Standards Program. This program furthers the Department's mission by addressing sex offender treatment and standards in the District of Columbia, states, territories and certain federally recognized Indian tribes.

SMART FY 16 Promoting Evidence Integration in Sex Offender Management: Development and Implementation of Sex Offender Treatment Standards

Applications Due: May 9, 2016

Eligibility

Eligible applicants are nonprofit organizations and for-profit organizations (including tribal organizations), individuals, institutions of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education), faith-based organizations, and community organizations and consortiums with demonstrated experience in the treatment, assessment, and management of adults and juveniles who commit sex offenses. For-profit organizations must agree to waive any profits or fees for services.

The SMART Office welcomes applications that involve two or more entities that will carry out the funded Federal award activities; however, one eligible entity must be the applicant and the other(s) must be proposed as subrecipient(s). The applicant must be the entity with primary responsibility for administering the funding and managing the entire SMART FY 16 Promoting Evidence Integration in Sex Offender Management: Development and Implementation of Sex Offender Treatment Standards. Only one application per lead applicant will be considered; however, a subrecipient may be part of multiple proposals.

The SMART Office may elect to make awards for applications submitted under this solicitation in future fiscal years, dependent on, among other considerations, the merit of the applications and on the availability of funds.

Deadline

Applicants must register with Grants.gov prior to submitting an application. All applications are due to be submitted and in receipt of a successful validation message in Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on May 9, 2016.

All applicants are encouraged to read this [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#).

For additional information, see [How to Apply](#) in Section D. Application and Submission Information.

Contact Information

For technical assistance with submitting an application, contact the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at 800-518-4726 or 606-545-5035, or via email to support@grants.gov. The Grants.gov Support Hotline hours of operation are 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except federal holidays.

Applicants that experience unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond their control that prevent them from submitting their application by the deadline must email the SMART Office contact identified below **within 24 hours after the application deadline** and request approval to submit their application. Additional information on reporting technical issues is found under "Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues" in the [How to Apply](#) section.

For assistance with any other requirements of this solicitation, contact Marlon Daley, Grant Management Specialist, by telephone at 202-514-5231, or by email at Marlon.Daley@usdoj.gov; or Scott Matson, Senior Policy Advisor, by telephone at 202-305-4560, or by email at Scott.Matson@usdoj.gov.

Grants.gov number assigned to this announcement: SMART-2016-8955

Release date: March 25, 2016

Contents

A. Program Description	4
Overview	4
Program-Specific Information	4
Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables	6
Evidence-Based Programs or Practices	8
B. Federal Award Information.....	8
Type of Award	8
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls	9
Budget Information	9
Cost Sharing or Matching Requirement	9
Pre-Agreement Cost (also known as Pre-award Cost) Approvals	10
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver	10
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs	10
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)	11
C. Eligibility Information.....	11
Limit on Number of Application Submissions	11
D. Application and Submission Information	11
What an Application Should Include	11
How to Apply.....	22
E. Application Review Information.....	25
Selection Criteria.....	25
Review Process	25
F. Federal Award Administration Information	26
Federal Award Notices	26
Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements	27
General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements	28
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)	28
H. Other Information.....	28
Provide Feedback to OJP.....	28
Application Checklist	29

SMART FY 16 Promoting Evidence Integration in Sex Offender Management: Development and Implementation of Sex Offender Treatment Standards

(CFDA 16.203)

A. Program Description

Overview

The Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering and Tracking (SMART) seeks applications for the development and implementation of standards for sex offender treatment. The SMART Office assists states, the District of Columbia, territories, and tribal jurisdictions with developing and/or enhancing programs designed to implement the requirements of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (SORNA) of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, and promotes innovation and best practices in the field of sex offender management. This program furthers the work of the SMART Office's Sex Offender Management Assessment and Planning Initiative (SOMAPI), a project designed to assess the state of research and practice in sex offender management and to inform the Office of Justice Programs' research and grant-making efforts in this area.¹

Based upon the growing body of research about the effectiveness of treatment for adults and juveniles who commit sex offenses, and in accordance with SORNA requirements, this solicitation supports the development and implementation of standards for the treatment of adult and juvenile sex offenders.

Program-Specific Information

The primary mission of the SMART Office is to assist jurisdictions in the implementation of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (SORNA); a secondary mission is to support innovation and best practices in the field of sex offender management. SORNA requires, among other things, that eligible sex offenders register for specific durations.² 42 U.S. Code § 16915 (b) of SORNA states that registration periods may be reduced for certain sex offenders, if the individual has maintained a clean record; that is:

1. no subsequent conviction that resulted in imprisonment for more than one year;
2. no subsequent conviction of any sex offense;
3. successful completion of any probation or parole sentence (with no revocation); and
4. successful completion of an appropriate sex offender treatment program certified by a jurisdiction or by the Attorney General.

¹ For further information see: <http://www.smart.gov/SOMAPI/index.html>

² See: 42 U.S. Code § 16915 (a).

While confirming the first three requirements of this provision are fairly straightforward, in order to certify whether an individual has successfully completed “an appropriate sex offender treatment program” necessitates identifying the components of “best practice” in the treatment of adults and adolescents who have sexually abused. Defining “best practice” must be based upon a body of research that continues to evolve.

While researchers agree that the evidence concerning the effectiveness of treatment for sex offenders is far from definitive, findings from systematic reviews and meta-analyses conducted in recent years suggest that certain sex offender treatment approaches can and do work. Specifically, cognitive-behavioral/relapse prevention approaches appear to be effective in reducing recidivism, whether delivered in an institutional or community-based setting. The empirical evidence also demonstrates, however, that differential treatment impacts are likely to occur for different individuals. Adhering to the risk-need-responsivity (RNR) principles of effective intervention appears to be important.³ Matching treatment to the risk levels and criminogenic needs of sex offenders may help maximize treatment effectiveness and the return on investment of treatment resources.⁴

Sex offenders differ in terms of their demographics, risk, and needs. Empirical evidence demonstrates that treatment may have a differential impact, depending on the characteristics of the treatment participant and other factors. This means that rather than following a one-size-fits-all approach, sex offender treatment is likely to be most effective when it is tailored to the risks, needs, and offense dynamics of individual sex offenders. The differential impact of treatment, and the need for tailored rather than uniform treatment approaches, was acknowledged by the national experts—both researchers and practitioners—at the SOMAPI forum.⁵

Treatment approaches across the United States vary widely in terms of availability, eligibility, modality, intensity, and even provider qualifications. Based upon findings from the latest Safer Society Foundation survey (2008) of sex offender treatment programs operating in the United States, programs serving adolescents primarily utilized a trauma-informed approach to treatment; programs serving adults often utilized a RNR approach. Therapists most frequently identified cognitive-behavioral therapy as one of the top three theoretical models that best described their treatment approach. Relapse prevention therapy was the second most frequently identified model, but the number of programs endorsing relapse prevention has fallen since 2002.⁶

The Safer Society Foundation survey also drew conclusions regarding effectiveness of treatment programs. The results suggests that a large percentage of programs in the United States are following practices known to be effective in reducing the reoffense of sexual offending behaviors. The criteria used in assessing the effectiveness of these programs included:

- Training and education of staff

³ Andrews, D.A. & Bonta, J. (2006). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*, 4th ed. Newark, NJ: Lexis Nexis.

⁴ See: http://www.smart.gov/SOMAPI/sec1/ch7_treatment.html

⁵ The SMART Office hosted the Sex Offender Management Research and Practice Discussion Forum (SOMAPI forum) in February 2012. At this event, national experts gathered in Washington, DC, to further refine what is known about the current state of sex offender management, gaps in research and practice, and the needs of the different disciplines involved in this work.

⁶ McGrath, R.J., Cumming, G., Burchard, B., Zeoli, S., & Ellerby, L. (2010). *Current Practices and Emerging Trends in Sexual Abuser Management: The Safer Society 2009 North American Survey*. Brandon, VT: Safer Society Press.

- Treatment program model
- Assessment methods
- Treatment targets
- Treatment dosage
- Specialized services
- Aftercare and support services
- Collaboration with other professionals
- Monitoring and evaluation

These criteria are not dissimilar to the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI-2000), a widely used tool designed to measure the effectiveness of offender intervention programming and adherence to the principles of RNR.⁷

The SMART Office is soliciting a set of standards to help jurisdictions design programs and/or assess the effectiveness of existing programs or providers who can competently satisfy the requirements set forth within SORNA. To develop these guidelines, an objective process must be articulated to evaluate the research relating to the assessment, treatment and management of adult and juvenile sex offenders. And once the standards are established, they should be easily accessible to practitioners and jurisdictions and provide a self-evaluation process that can be tailored to different environments and populations.

Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables

The SMART Office is seeking applications for the creation of treatment standards for adult and adolescent sex offenders. The goal of the project is to promote evidence-based knowledge and use that information to create benchmarks for federal and state agencies that make decisions regarding the reduction of registration periods for certain sex offenders, based upon a “clean record”. SMART seeks to achieve this goal through the creation of such standards.

An applicant will be selected for SMART Office funding based upon their responses to the Selection Criteria listed in the section, “What an Application Should Include” on page 11. The application should clearly describe and demonstrate how the project will:

- Collect new data about existing treatment programs and modalities within the United States.
- Develop standards for the treatment of sex offenders, adult and juvenile, that can be tailored to the individual needs of the offender.
- Identify up to five jurisdictions to implement the standards.
- Collect data on sex offenders within each jurisdiction, consistently across the five jurisdictions.
- Work collaboratively with the selected sites to incorporate the standards into sex offender management practices and train providers on its use.
- Document the process of implementation.
- Evaluate the efficacy of the standards using criteria similar to those used in the Safer Society Survey or the CPAI-2000.
- Develop and provide an easily accessible online referral mechanism for sex offender treatment programs utilizing these standards for practitioners and jurisdiction.

⁷ Gendreau, P., & Andrews, D. A. (2001). *The Correctional Program Assessment Inventory 2000 (CPAI 2000)*. Saint John, Canada: University of New Brunswick.

- Work collaboratively with the SMART Office.
- Participate in any external research or evaluations at a later date (should funds become available).

A comprehensive report will be the final deliverable for this project. The report should contain, but not be limited to the following:

- The final guidelines and standards for the treatment of adult and juvenile sex offenders.
- A detailed description of the theoretical and evidence-base for these guidelines and standards.
- Documentation of the process for implementing the initiative.
- An evaluation of the effectiveness of the standards.
- Descriptive information on the number of individuals affected within each of the selected jurisdictions.
- A national review of existing programs for both adults and adolescents in the United States.
- Any outcome information available from the above-mentioned outcomes of interest.

Site Selection

The treatment standards should be implemented in up to five jurisdictions that are geographically and demographically diverse. The applicant should provide evidence of the jurisdictions' adult and juvenile sex offender population, case flow and treatment referral process, treatment provider qualifications, assessment processes, probation and/or parole practices, and any treatment and/or recidivism outcome information. Applicants may include financial incentives in their proposed project budgets to encourage jurisdiction participation. The jurisdictions selected to participate in the project will not receive external funding from the SMART Office.

Applicants are encouraged to include a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or Letter of Intent from each jurisdiction detailing their commitment to participate in the project in their submitted application. This document should be provided to SMART before an award is made. A special condition will be attached to the award stipulating that the grantee may not obligate, expend, or drawdown any project funds until SMART has received an MOU or Letter of Intent from the participating sites.

The selected grantee will be responsible for the following activities:

- Work collaboratively with the selected jurisdictions to incorporate the standards developed for this project into the jurisdictions' sex offender management practices and train providers on its use.
- Work with the selected sites to track the implementation of the standards.
- Work with the sites to evaluate the efficacy of the standards.
- Report and disseminate interim and final project results.

Additionally, the grantee will be responsible for assisting the jurisdictions in implementing the standards with fidelity. This may be accomplished by ensuring:

- That jurisdictions and their staff/providers are trained in a theoretical model of change.
- Staff/providers are trained and support validated risk assessment tools and processes.

- Staff/providers are trained in cognitive behavior therapy and programming and have processes in place to ensure skill development.
- That jurisdictions have resource support in place for implementation, training, ongoing quality control, and evaluation.
- That jurisdictions have the staff resources and expertise to ensure quality management and integrity.

Evidence-Based Programs or Practices

OJP strongly emphasizes the use of data and evidence in policy making and program development in criminal justice, juvenile justice, and crime victim services. OJP is committed to:

- Improving the quantity and quality of evidence OJP generates
- Integrating evidence into program, practice, and policy decisions within OJP and the field
- Improving the translation of evidence into practice

OJP considers programs and practices to be evidence-based when their effectiveness has been demonstrated by causal evidence, generally obtained through one or more outcome evaluations. Causal evidence documents a relationship between an activity or intervention (including technology) and its intended outcome, including measuring the direction and size of a change, and the extent to which a change may be attributed to the activity or intervention. Causal evidence depends on the use of scientific methods to rule out, to the extent possible, alternative explanations for the documented change. The strength of causal evidence, based on the factors described above, will influence the degree to which OJP considers a program or practice to be evidence-based. The [OJP CrimeSolutions.gov](http://OJP.CrimeSolutions.gov) website is one resource that applicants may use to find information about evidence-based programs in criminal justice, juvenile justice, and crime victim services.

B. Federal Award Information

The SMART Office estimates that it will make one award of up to \$1,000,000 for a for a 36-month project period, beginning on September 30, 2016.

The SMART Office may, in certain cases, provide supplemental funding in future years to the award under this solicitation. Important considerations in decisions regarding supplemental funding include, among other factors, the availability of funding, strategic priorities, assessment of the quality of the management of the award (for example, timeliness and quality of progress reports), and assessment of the progress of the work funded under the award.

All awards are subject to the availability of appropriated funds and to any modifications or additional requirements that may be imposed by law.

Type of Award⁸

The SMART Office expects that it will make any award from this solicitation in the form of a cooperative agreement, which is a particular type of grant used if the SMART Office expects to

⁸ See *generally* 31 U.S.C. §§ 6301-6305 (defines and describes various forms of federal assistance relationships, including grants and cooperative agreements (a type of grant)).

have ongoing substantial involvement in award activities. Substantial involvement includes direct oversight and involvement with the grantee organization in implementation of the grant, but does not involve day-to-day project management. See [Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements](#), under [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#), for details regarding the federal involvement anticipated under an award from this solicitation.

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

If selected for funding, the award recipient(s) and subrecipient(s) (including any recipient or subrecipient funded in response to this solicitation that is a pass-through entity⁹) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.303:

- (a) Establish and maintain effective internal control over the Federal award that provides reasonable assurance that the recipient (and any subrecipient) is managing the Federal award in compliance with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the Federal award. These internal controls should be in compliance with guidance in “Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government” issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and the “Internal Control Integrated Framework”, issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO).
- (b) Comply with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the Federal awards.
- (c) Evaluate and monitor the recipient’s (and any subrecipient’s) compliance with statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of Federal awards.
- (d) Take prompt action when instances of noncompliance are identified including noncompliance identified in audit findings.
- (e) Take reasonable measures to safeguard protected personally identifiable information and other information the Federal awarding agency or pass-through entity designates as sensitive or the recipient (or any subrecipient) considers sensitive consistent with applicable Federal, state, local, and tribal laws regarding privacy and obligations of confidentiality.

In order to better understand administrative requirements and cost principles, applicants **must** enroll, and complete at no charge, the Department of Justice Grants Financial Management Online Training available [here](#).

Budget Information

Cost Sharing or Matching Requirement

This solicitation does not require a match. However, if a successful application proposes a voluntary match amount, and OJP approves the budget, the total match amount incorporated into the approved budget becomes mandatory and subject to audit.

⁹ For purposes of this solicitation (or program announcement), “pass-through entity” includes any entity eligible to receive funding as a recipient or subrecipient under this solicitation (or program announcement) that, if funded, may make a subaward(s) to a subrecipient(s) to carry out part of the funded program.

For additional cost sharing and match information, see the [Financial Guide](#).

Pre-Agreement Cost (also known as Pre-award Cost) Approvals

Pre-agreement costs are costs incurred by the applicant prior to the start date of the period of performance of the grant award.

OJP does not typically approve pre-agreement costs; an applicant must request and obtain the prior written approval of OJP for all such costs. If approved, pre-agreement costs could be paid from grant funds consistent with a grantee's approved budget, and under applicable cost standards. However, all such costs prior to award and prior to approval of the costs are incurred at the sole risk of an applicant. Generally, no applicant should incur project costs *before* submitting an application requesting federal funding for those costs. Should there be extenuating circumstances that appear to be appropriate for OJP's consideration as pre-agreement costs, the applicant should contact the point of contact listed on the title page of this announcement for details on the requirements for submitting a written request for approval. See the section on Costs Requiring Prior Approval in the [Financial Guide](#), for more information.

Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver

With respect to any award of more than \$250,000 made under this solicitation, recipients may not use federal funds to pay total cash compensation (salary plus cash bonuses) to any employee of the award recipient at a rate that exceeds 110% of the maximum annual salary payable to a member of the Federal Government's Senior Executive Service (SES) at an agency with a Certified SES Performance Appraisal System for that year.¹⁰ The 2016 salary table for SES employees is available at the Office of Personnel Management [website](#). Note: A recipient may compensate an employee at a greater rate, provided the amount in excess of this compensation limitation is paid with non-federal funds. (Any such additional compensation will not be considered matching funds where match requirements apply.) For employees who charge only a portion of their time to an award, the allowable amount to be charged is equal to the percentage of time worked times the maximum salary limitation.

The Assistant Attorney General for OJP may exercise discretion to waive, on an individual basis, the limitation on compensation rates allowable under an award. An applicant requesting a waiver should include a detailed justification in the budget narrative of the application. Unless the applicant submits a waiver request and justification with the application, the applicant should anticipate that OJP will request the applicant to adjust and resubmit the budget.

The justification should include the particular qualifications and expertise of the individual, the uniqueness of the service the individual will provide, the individual's specific knowledge of the program or project being undertaken with award funds, and a statement explaining that the individual's salary is commensurate with the regular and customary rate for an individual with his/her qualifications and expertise, and for the work to be done.

Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs

OJP strongly encourages applicants that propose to use award funds for any conference-, meeting-, or training-related activity to review carefully—before submitting an application—the OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting available at www.ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm. OJP policy and

¹⁰ OJP does not apply this limitation on the use of award funds to the nonprofit organizations listed at Appendix VIII to 2 C.F.R. Part 200.

guidance (1) encourage minimization of conference, meeting, and training costs; (2) require prior written approval (which may affect project timelines) of most conference, meeting, and training costs for cooperative agreement recipients and of some conference, meeting, and training costs for grant recipients; and (3) set cost limits, including a general prohibition of all food and beverage costs.

Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)

If an applicant proposes a program or activity that would deliver services or benefits to individuals, the costs of taking reasonable steps to provide meaningful access to those services or benefits for individuals with limited English proficiency may be allowable. Reasonable steps to provide meaningful access to services or benefits may include interpretation or translation services where appropriate.

For additional information, see the "Civil Rights Compliance" section under "Solicitation Requirements" in the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

C. Eligibility Information

For additional eligibility information, see title page.

For additional information on cost sharing or matching requirements, see [Section B. Federal Award Information](#).

Limit on Number of Application Submissions

If an applicant submits multiple versions of the same application, the SMART Office will review only the most recent system-validated version submitted. For more information on system-validated versions, see [How to Apply](#).

D. Application and Submission Information

What an Application Should Include

Applicants should anticipate that if they fail to submit an application that contains all of the specified elements, it may negatively affect the review of their application; and, should a decision be made to make an award, it may result in the inclusion of special conditions that preclude the recipient from accessing or using award funds pending satisfaction of the conditions.

Moreover, applicants should anticipate that applications that are determined to be nonresponsive to the scope of the solicitation, or that do not include the application elements that the SMART Office has designated to be critical, will neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration. Under this solicitation, the SMART Office has designated the following application elements as critical: Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet, Budget Narrative, and requested funding amount that does not exceed the maximum amount allowable. Applicants may combine the Budget Narrative and the Budget Detail Worksheet in one document. However, if an applicant submits only one budget document, it must contain **both** narrative and detail information. Please review the "Note on File Names and File Types" under [How to Apply](#) to be sure applications are submitted in permitted formats.

OJP strongly recommends that applicants use appropriately descriptive file names (e.g., "Program Narrative," "Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative," "Timelines," "Memoranda of Understanding," "Résumés") for all attachments. Also, OJP recommends that applicants include résumés in a single file.

1. Information to Complete the Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)

The SF-424 is a required standard form used as a cover sheet for submission of pre-applications, applications, and related information. Grants.gov and the OJP Grants Management System (GMS) take information from the applicant's profile to populate the fields on this form. When selecting "type of applicant," if the applicant is a for-profit entity, select "For-Profit Organization" or "Small Business" (as applicable).

Intergovernmental Review: This funding opportunity (program) **is not** subject to [Executive Order 12372](#). (In completing the SF-424, applicants are to make the appropriate selection in response to question 19 to indicate that the "Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.")

2. Project Abstract

Applications should include a high-quality project abstract that summarizes the proposed project in 400 words or less. Project abstracts should be—

- Written for a general public audience
- Submitted as a separate attachment with "Project Abstract" as part of its file name
- Single-spaced, using a standard 12-point font (Times New Roman) with 1-inch margins

As a separate attachment, the project abstract will **not** count against the page limit for the program narrative.

All project abstracts should follow the detailed template available at ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/ProjectAbstractTemplate.pdf.

Permission to Share Project Abstract with the Public:

It is unlikely that the SMART Office will be able to fund all applications submitted under this solicitation, but it may have the opportunity to share information with the public regarding unfunded applications, for example, through a listing on a web page available to the public. The intent of this public posting would be to allow other possible funders to become aware of such proposals.

In the project abstract template, applicants are asked to indicate whether they give OJP permission to share their project abstract (including contact information) with the public. Granting (or failing to grant) this permission will not affect OJP's funding decisions, and, if the application is not funded, granting permission will not guarantee that abstract information will be shared, nor will it guarantee funding from any other source.

Note: OJP may choose not to list a project that otherwise would have been included in a listing of unfunded applications, should the abstract fail to meet the format and content requirements noted above and outlined in the project abstract template.

3. Program Narrative

The program narrative must respond to the solicitation and present a detailed description of the purpose, scope, goals and objectives of the proposed project. The program narrative must be double-spaced, using a standard 12-point font (Times New Roman is preferred) with 1-inch margins, and must not exceed 25 pages. Please number pages “1 of 25,” “2 of 25,” etc. Submissions that do not adhere to the format will be deemed ineligible. Information required under the “Budget and Budget Narrative” and “Other Attachments” sections will not count toward the program narrative page count. If the program narrative fails to comply with these length-related restrictions, *[insert BPO]* may consider such noncompliance in peer review and in final award decisions.

The following sections should be included as part of the program narrative.

a. Statement of the Problem

Applicant must describe the existing challenges and variations in treatment programming for adults and juveniles who commit sexual offenses in the United States. Discussion should highlight the issues associated with working with this population, including a synopsis of research literature, treatment program types and availability, differential treatment efficacy, recidivism outcomes, and a description of the demographics, offender population, services available to these offenders, and outcome data in the sites intended to be selected to implement the standards.

b. Project Design and Implementation

Applicant must detail how the project will operate during the funding period and describe the strategy that will be used to implement the proposed project. This section should illustrate what phases and activities are proposed for the project, site selection and implementation of the standards, evaluation activities, and a description of how the strategy will support the overall goals and objectives. Applicant should include a project timeline.

c. Capabilities and Competencies

Applicant must describe the management structure and staffing of the project and include information that describes the roles and responsibility of key organizational and functional components and personnel. This section must describe the experience and capability of the applicant and any contractors that will be used to implement the project and should highlight any previous experience implementing projects of similar design and magnitude. Discussion must demonstrate the applicant’s competence and experience in working with individuals who commit sexual offenses, as well as experience in developing, implementing, and evaluating treatment programming. The management and organizational structure described should match the staff needs necessary to accomplish the tasks outlined in the project work plan. Position descriptions and resumes for key personnel must be submitted as an attachment.

d. Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation’s Performance Measures

The applicant should describe how performance will be documented, monitored, and evaluated, including how the impact of the strategy implemented and/or enhancement will be determined.

To demonstrate program progress and success, as well as, to assist the Department with fulfilling its responsibilities under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), Public Law 103-62, and the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010, Public Law 111–352, applicants that receive funding under this solicitation must provide data that measure the results of their work done under this solicitation. OJP will require any award recipient, post award, to provide the data requested in the “Data Grantee Provides” column so that OJP can calculate values for the “Performance Measures” column. Performance measures for this solicitation are as follows:

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Data Grantee Provides
Develop and implement offender treatment standards for adult and adolescent sex offenders	Number of new sex offender treatment standards for adults offenders developed	Describe the sex offender treatment standards for adults, and report on the implementation process and provide supporting data
	Number of new sex offender treatment standards for adolescents developed	Describe the sex offender treatment standards for adolescents, and report on the implementation process and provide supporting data
	Number of sex offender treatment standards, policies, procedures, strategies that are supported by evidence to be replicable or a best practice.	Describe how treatment standards for adolescent and adults will be tailored for individual need Report on the treatment standards implementation process and provide supporting data
Collect data on sex offenders within each jurisdiction. consistently across the five jurisdictions	Percent of adolescents who exhibit a desired change through treatment	Report on offender population, demographics, and a report describing the treatment implementation process and supporting data

	Percent of adults who exhibit a desired change through treatment	Report on offender population, demographics, and a report describing the treatment implementation process and supporting data
Work collaboratively with selected sites to incorporate the standards into sex offender management practices and train providers on its use	Number of sites that incorporated the treatment standards	A description of the sites' offender population, demographics, and a report describing the implementation and evaluation process and supporting data A description of case flow, treatment referral process, treatment provider qualifications, and assessment processes
	Number of training materials developed	Delivered description of the training materials developed, the developed materials and a report describing the training process
	Percent of individuals trained who reported an increase in knowledge, skills, and/or abilities	Number of providers trained who reported an increase in knowledge, skills, and/or abilities Number of providers trained
Evaluate the efficacy of the standards using criteria similar to those used in the Safer Society Survey or the CPAI-2000	Number of sites implementing standards	Number of sites that implemented the treatment standards
	Number of deliverables completed on time	A report describing the efficacy of the developed and implemented standards for adolescent and adults sex offenders
	Number of deliverables that meet expectations	

Conduct a survey of treatment programs in use throughout the United States	Number of deliverables completed on time Number of deliverables that meet expectations	Provide a report on providers trained, topic, and results of training Provide the results of the survey of treatment programs in the United States Document the development of the treatment referral system
Develop an online treatment referral system accessible by practitioners and jurisdictions	Developed and implemented online sex offender treatment referral system website	Evidence of the online treatment referral system developed, including screenshots, URLs, user's manuals, training materials, and data on contents and usage

The SMART Office does not require applicants to submit performance measures data with their application. Performance measures are included as an alert that the SMART Office will require successful applicants to submit specific data as part of their reporting requirements. For the application, applicants should indicate an understanding of these requirements and discuss how they will gather the required data, should they receive funding.

Note on Project Evaluations

Applicants that propose to use funds awarded through this solicitation to conduct project evaluations should be aware that certain project evaluations (such as systematic investigations designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge) may constitute “research” for purposes of applicable DOJ human subjects protection regulations. However, project evaluations that are intended only to generate internal improvements to a program or service, or are conducted only to meet OJP’s performance measure data reporting requirements likely do not constitute “research.” Applicants should provide sufficient information for OJP to determine whether the particular project they propose would either intentionally or unintentionally collect and/or use information in such a way that it meets the DOJ regulatory definition of research.

Research, for the purposes of human subjects protections for OJP-funded programs, is defined as, “a systematic investigation, including research development, testing, and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge” 28 C.F.R. § 46.102(d). For additional information on determining whether a proposed activity would constitute research, see the decision tree to assist applicants on the “Research and the Protection of Human Subjects” section of the [OJP Funding Resource Center](http://www.ojp.gov/funding/Explore/SolicitationRequirements/EvidenceResearchEvaluationRequirem) web page (www.ojp.gov/funding/Explore/SolicitationRequirements/EvidenceResearchEvaluationRequirem)

[ents.htm](#)). Applicants whose proposals may involve a research or statistical component also should review the “Data Privacy and Confidentiality Requirements” section on that web page.

4. Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative

a. Budget Detail Worksheet

A sample Budget Detail Worksheet can be found at www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/BudgetDetailWorksheet.pdf. Applicants that submit their budget in a different format should include the budget categories listed in the sample budget worksheet. The Budget Detail Worksheet should be broken down by year.

For questions pertaining to budget and examples of allowable and unallowable costs, see the Financial Guide at <http://ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/index.htm>.

b. Budget Narrative

The budget narrative should thoroughly and clearly describe every category of expense listed in the Budget Detail Worksheet. OJP expects proposed budgets to be complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities).

Applicants should demonstrate in their budget narratives how they will maximize cost effectiveness of grant expenditures. Budget narratives should generally describe cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project. For example, a budget narrative should detail why planned in-person meetings are necessary, or how technology and collaboration with outside organizations could be used to reduce costs, without compromising quality.

The narrative should be mathematically sound and correspond with the information and figures provided in the Budget Detail Worksheet. The narrative should explain how the applicant estimated and calculated all costs, and how they are relevant to the completion of the proposed project. The narrative may include tables for clarification purposes but need not be in a spreadsheet format. As with the Budget Detail Worksheet, the Budget Narrative should be broken down by year.

c. Non-Competitive Procurement Contracts In Excess of Simplified Acquisition Threshold

If an applicant proposes to make one or more non-competitive procurements of products or services, where the non-competitive procurement will exceed the simplified acquisition threshold (also known as the small purchase threshold), which is currently set at \$150,000, the application should address the considerations outlined in the [Financial Guide](#).

d. Pre-Agreement Cost Approvals

For information on pre-agreement costs, see [Section B. Federal Award Information](#).

5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Indirect costs are allowed only under the following circumstances:

- (a) The applicant has a current, federally approved indirect cost rate; or
- (b) The applicant is eligible to use and elects to use the “de minimis” indirect cost rate described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.414(f).

Attach a copy of the federally approved indirect cost rate agreement to the application. Applicants that do not have an approved rate may request one through their cognizant federal agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant organization, or, if the applicant's accounting system permits, costs may be allocated in the direct cost categories. For the definition of Cognizant Federal Agency, see the "Glossary of Terms" in the [Financial Guide](#). For assistance with identifying your cognizant agency, please contact the Customer Service Center at 1-800-458-0786 or at ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov. If DOJ is the cognizant federal agency, applicants may obtain information needed to submit an indirect cost rate proposal at <http://www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/IndirectCosts.pdf>.

In order to use the "de minimis" indirect rate, attach written documentation to the application that advises OJP of both the applicant's eligibility (to use the "de minimis" rate) and its election. If the applicant elects the "de minimis" method, costs must be consistently charged as either indirect or direct costs, but may not be double charged or inconsistently charged as both. In addition, if this method is chosen then it must be used consistently for all federal awards until such time as you choose to negotiate a federally approved indirect cost rate.¹¹

6. Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)

Tribes, tribal organizations, or third parties proposing to provide direct services or assistance to residents on tribal lands should include in their applications a resolution, a letter, affidavit, or other documentation, as appropriate, that certifies that the applicant has the legal authority from the tribe(s) to implement the proposed project on tribal lands. In those instances when an organization or consortium of tribes applies for a grant on behalf of a tribe or multiple specific tribes, the application should include appropriate legal documentation, as described above, from all tribes that would receive services or assistance under the grant. A consortium of tribes for which existing consortium bylaws allow action without support from all tribes in the consortium (i.e., without an authorizing resolution or comparable legal documentation from each tribal governing body) may submit, instead, a copy of its consortium bylaws with the application.

Applicants unable to submit an application that includes a fully-executed (i.e., signed) copy of appropriate legal documentation, as described above, consistent with the applicable tribe's governance structure, should, at a minimum, submit an unsigned, draft version of such legal documentation as part of its application (except for cases in which, with respect to a tribal consortium applicant, consortium bylaws allow action without the support of all consortium member tribes). If selected for funding, the SMART Office will make use of and access to funds contingent on receipt of the fully-executed legal documentation.

7. Applicant Disclosure of High Risk Status

Applicants are to disclose whether they are currently designated high risk by another federal grant making agency. This includes any status requiring additional oversight by the federal agency due to past programmatic or financial concerns. If an applicant is designated high risk by another federal grant making agency, you must email the following information to OJPComplianceReporting@usdoj.gov at the time of application submission:

- The federal agency that currently designated the applicant as high risk
- Date the applicant was designated high risk

¹¹ See 2 C.F.R. § 200.414(f).

- The high risk point of contact name, phone number, and email address, from that federal agency
- Reasons for the high risk status

OJP seeks this information to ensure appropriate federal oversight of any grant award. Disclosing this high risk information does not disqualify any organization from receiving an OJP award. However, additional grant oversight may be included, if necessary, in award documentation.

8. Additional Attachments

a. Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications

Applicants are to disclose whether they have pending applications for federally funded grants or subgrants (including cooperative agreements) that include requests for funding to support the same project being proposed under this solicitation and will cover the identical cost items outlined in the budget narrative and worksheet in the application under this solicitation. The disclosure should include both direct applications for federal funding (e.g., applications to federal agencies) and indirect applications for such funding (e.g., applications to State agencies that will subaward federal funds).

OJP seeks this information to help avoid any inappropriate duplication of funding. Leveraging multiple funding sources in a complementary manner to implement comprehensive programs or projects is encouraged and is not seen as inappropriate duplication.

Applicants that have pending applications as described above are to provide the following information about pending applications submitted within the last 12 months:

- The federal or state funding agency
- The solicitation name/project name
- The point of contact information at the applicable funding agency

Federal or State Funding Agency	Solicitation Name/Project Name	Name/Phone/Email for Point of Contact at Funding Agency
DOJ/COPS	COPS Hiring Program	Jane Doe, 202/000-0000; jane.doe@usdoj.gov
HHS/ Substance Abuse & Mental Health Services Administration	Drug Free Communities Mentoring Program/ North County Youth Mentoring Program	John Doe, 202/000-0000; john.doe@hhs.gov

Applicants should include the table as a separate attachment to their application. The file should be named "Disclosure of Pending Applications." Applicants that do not have pending applications as described above are to include a statement to this effect in the separate attachment page (e.g., "[Applicant Name on SF-424] does not have pending

applications submitted within the last 12 months for federally funded grants or subgrants (including cooperative agreements) that include requests for funding to support the same project being proposed under this solicitation and will cover the identical cost items outlined in the budget narrative and worksheet in the application under this solicitation.”).

b. Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity

If a proposal involves research and/or evaluation, regardless of the proposal’s other merits, in order to receive funds, the applicant must demonstrate research/evaluation independence, including appropriate safeguards to ensure research/evaluation objectivity and integrity, both in this proposal and as it may relate to the applicant’s other current or prior related projects. This documentation may be included as an attachment to the application which addresses BOTH i. and ii. below.

- i. For purposes of this solicitation, applicants must document research and evaluation independence and integrity by including, at a minimum, one of the following two items:
 - a. A specific assurance that the applicant has reviewed its proposal to identify any research integrity issues (including all principal investigators and sub-recipients) and it has concluded that the design, conduct, or reporting of research and evaluation funded by the SMART Office grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts will not be biased by any personal or financial conflict of interest on the part of part of its staff, consultants, and/or sub-recipients responsible for the research and evaluation or on the part of the applicant organization;

OR

- b. A specific listing of actual or perceived conflicts of interest that the applicant has identified in relation to this proposal. These conflicts could be either personal (related to specific staff, consultants, and/or sub-recipients) or organizational (related to the applicant or any subgrantee organization). Examples of potential investigator (or other personal) conflict situations may include, but are not limited to, those in which an investigator would be in a position to evaluate a spouse’s work product (actual conflict), or an investigator would be in a position to evaluate the work of a former or current colleague (potential apparent conflict). With regard to potential organizational conflicts of interest, as one example, generally an organization could not be given a grant to evaluate a project if that organization had itself provided substantial prior technical assistance to that specific project or a location implementing the project (whether funded by OJP or other sources), as the organization in such an instance would appear to be evaluating the effectiveness of its own prior work. The key is whether a reasonable person understanding all of the facts would be able to have confidence that the results of any research or evaluation project are objective and reliable. Any outside personal or financial interest that casts doubt on that objectivity and reliability of an evaluation or research product is a problem and must be disclosed.

- ii. In addition, for purposes of this solicitation applicants must address the issue of possible mitigation of research integrity concerns by including, at a minimum, one of the following two items:
 - a. If an applicant reasonably believes that no potential personal or organizational conflicts of interest exist, then the applicant should provide a brief narrative explanation of how and why it reached that conclusion. Applicants MUST also include an explanation of the specific processes and procedures that the applicant will put in place to identify and eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) potential personal or financial conflicts of interest on the part of its staff, consultants, and/or sub-recipients for this particular project, should that be necessary during the grant period. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard could include organizational codes of ethics/conduct or policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest.

OR

- b. If the applicant has identified specific personal or organizational conflicts of interest in its proposal during this review, the applicant must propose a specific and robust mitigation plan to address conflicts noted above. At a minimum, the plan must include specific processes and procedures that the applicant will put in place to eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) potential personal or financial conflicts of interest on the part of its staff, consultants, and/or sub-recipients for this particular project, should that be necessary during the grant period. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard could include organizational codes of ethics/conduct or policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest. There is no guarantee that the plan, if any, will be accepted as proposed.

Considerations in assessing research and evaluation independence and integrity will include, but are not be limited to, the adequacy of the applicant's efforts to identify factors that could affect the objectivity or integrity of the proposed staff and/or the organization in carrying out the research, development, or evaluation activity; and the adequacy of the applicant's existing or proposed remedies to control any such factors.

c. Project timeline

d. Position descriptions and résumés for key personnel

9. Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire

In accordance with the Part 200 Uniform Requirements as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.205, Federal agencies must have in place a framework for evaluating the risks posed by applicants before they receive a Federal award. To facilitate part of this risk evaluation, **all** applicants (other than an individual) are to download, complete, and submit this [form](#).

10. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

All applicants must complete this information. Applicants that expend any funds for lobbying activities are to provide the detailed information requested on the form Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL). Applicants that do not expend any funds for lobbying activities

are to enter “N/A” in the text boxes for item 10 (“a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant” and “b. Individuals Performing Services”).

How to Apply

Applicants must register in, and submit applications through Grants.gov, a primary source to find federal funding opportunities and apply for funding. Find complete instructions on how to register and submit an application at www.Grants.gov. Applicants that experience technical difficulties during this process should call the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at **800-518-4726** or **606-545-5035**, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except federal holidays. Registering with Grants.gov is a one-time process; however, **processing delays may occur, and it can take several weeks** for first-time registrants to receive confirmation and a user password. OJP encourages applicants to **register several weeks before** the application submission deadline. In addition, OJP urges applicants to submit applications 72 hours prior to the application due date to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification.

The SMART Office strongly encourages all prospective applicants to sign up for Grants.gov email [notifications](#) regarding this solicitation. If this solicitation is cancelled or modified, individuals who sign up with Grants.gov for updates will be automatically notified.

Browser Information: Grants.gov was built to be compatible with Internet Explorer. For technical assistance with Google Chrome, or another browser, contact Grants.gov Customer Support.

Note on Attachments. Grants.gov has two categories of files for attachments: mandatory and optional. OJP receives all files attached in both categories. Please insure all required documents are attached in the mandatory category.

Note on File Names and File Types: Grants.gov only permits the use of certain specific characters in names of attachment files. Valid file names may include only the characters shown in the table below. Grants.gov is designed to reject any application that includes an attachment(s) with a file name that contains any characters not shown in the table below.

Characters	Special Characters		
Upper case (A – Z)	Parenthesis ()	Curly braces { }	Square brackets []
Lower case (a – z)	Ampersand (&)	Tilde (~)	Exclamation point (!)
Underscore (_)	Comma (,)	Semicolon (;)	Apostrophe (')
Hyphen (-)	At sign (@)	Number sign (#)	Dollar sign (\$)
Space	Percent sign (%)	Plus sign (+)	Equal sign (=)
Period (.)	When using the ampersand (&) in XML, applicants must use the “&amp;” format.		

Grants.gov is designed to forward successfully submitted applications to the OJP Grants Management System (GMS).

GMS does not accept executable file types as application attachments. These disallowed file types include, but are not limited to, the following extensions: “.com,” “.bat,” “.exe,” “.vbs,” “.cfg,” “.dat,” “.db,” “.dbf,” “.dll,” “.ini,” “.log,” “.ora,” “.sys,” and “.zip.” GMS may reject applications with files that use these extensions. It is important to allow time to change the type of file(s) if the application is rejected.

All applicants are required to complete the following steps:

OJP may not make a federal award to an applicant organization until the applicant organization has complied with all applicable DUNS and SAM requirements. Individual applicants must comply with all Grants.gov requirements. If an applicant has not fully complied with the requirements by the time the federal awarding agency is ready to make a federal award, the federal awarding agency may determine that the applicant is not qualified to receive a federal award and use that determination as a basis for making a federal award to another applicant.

Individual applicants should search Grants.gov for a funding opportunity for which individuals are eligible to apply. Use the Funding Opportunity Number (FON) to register. Complete the registration form at <https://apply07.grants.gov/apply/IndCPRRegister> to create a username and password. Individual applicants should complete all steps except 1, 2 and 4.

- 1. Acquire a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number.** In general, the Office of Management and Budget requires that all applicants (other than individuals) for federal funds include a DUNS number in their applications for a new award or a supplement to an existing award. A DUNS number is a unique nine-digit sequence recognized as the universal standard for identifying and differentiating entities receiving federal funds. The identifier is used for tracking purposes and to validate address and point of contact information for federal assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. The DUNS number will be used throughout the grant life cycle. Obtaining a DUNS number is a free, one-time activity. Call Dun and Bradstreet at 866-705-5711 to obtain a DUNS number or apply online at www.dnb.com. A DUNS number is usually received within 1-2 business days.
- 2. Acquire registration with the System for Award Management (SAM).** SAM is the repository for standard information about federal financial assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. OJP requires all applicants (other than individuals) for federal financial assistance to maintain current registrations in the SAM database. Applicants must be registered in SAM to successfully register in Grants.gov. Applicants must **update or renew their SAM registration annually** to maintain an active status. SAM registration and renewal can take as long as 10 business days to complete.

Applications cannot be successfully submitted in Grants.gov until Grants.gov receives the SAM registration information. Once the SAM registration/renewal is complete, **the information transfer from SAM to Grants.gov can take up to 48 hours.** OJP recommends that the applicant register or renew registration with SAM as early as possible.

Information about SAM registration procedures can be accessed at www.sam.gov.

- 3. Acquire an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) and a Grants.gov username and password.** Complete the AOR profile on Grants.gov and create a username and password. The applicant organization's DUNS number must be used to complete this step. For more information about the registration process for organizations, go to www.grants.gov/web/grants/register.html. Individuals registering with Grants.gov should go to <http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/individual-registration.html>.
- 4. Acquire confirmation for the AOR from the E-Business Point of Contact (E-Biz POC).** The E-Biz POC at the applicant organization must log into Grants.gov to confirm the applicant organization's AOR. The E-Biz POC will need the Marketing Partner Identification

Number (MPIN) password obtained when registering with SAM to complete this step. Note that an organization can have more than one AOR.

5. **Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov.** Use the following identifying information when searching for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number for this solicitation is 16.203, titled “SMART FY 16 Promoting Evidence Integration in Sex Offender Management: Discretionary Grant Program,” and the funding opportunity number is SMART-2016-8955.
6. **Submit a valid application consistent with this solicitation by following the directions in Grants.gov.** Within 24–48 hours after submitting the electronic application, the applicant should receive two notifications from Grants.gov. The first will confirm the receipt of the application and the second will state whether the application has been successfully validated, or rejected due to errors, with an explanation. It is possible to first receive a message indicating that the application is received and then receive a rejection notice a few minutes or hours later. Submitting well ahead of the deadline provides time to correct the problem(s) that caused the rejection. **Important:** OJP urges applicants to submit applications **at least 72 hours prior** to the application due date to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification. All applications are due to be submitted and in receipt of a successful validation message in Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on May 9, 2016.

Click [here](#) for further details on DUNS, SAM, and Grants.gov registration steps and timeframes.

Note: Duplicate Applications

If an applicant submits multiple versions of the same application, the SMART Office will review only the most recent system-validated version submitted. See Note on File Names and File Types under [How to Apply](#).

Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues

Applicants that experience unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond their control that prevent them from submitting their application by the deadline must contact the Grants.gov [Customer Support Hotline](#) or the [SAM Help Desk](#) (Federal Service Desk) to report the technical issue and receive a tracking number. Then applicant must email the SMART Office contact identified in the Contact Information section on page 2 **within 24 hours after the application deadline** and request approval to submit their application. The email must describe the technical difficulties, and include a timeline of the applicant’s submission efforts, the complete grant application, the applicant’s DUNS number, and any Grants.gov Help Desk or SAM tracking number(s). **Note: The SMART Office does *not* automatically approve requests.** After the program office reviews the submission, and contacts the Grants.gov or SAM Help Desks to validate the reported technical issues, OJP will inform the applicant whether the request to submit a late application has been approved or denied. If OJP determines that the applicant failed to follow all required procedures, which resulted in an untimely application submission, OJP will deny the applicant’s request to submit their application.

The following conditions are generally insufficient to justify late submissions:

- Failure to register in SAM or Grants.gov in sufficient time (SAM registration and renewal can take as long as 10 business days to complete. The information transfer from SAM to Grants.gov can take up to 48 hours.)
- Failure to follow Grants.gov instructions on how to register and apply as posted on its website
- Failure to follow each instruction in the OJP solicitation
- Technical issues with the applicant's computer or information technology environment, including firewalls, browser incompatibility, etc.

Notifications regarding known technical problems with Grants.gov, if any, are posted at the top of the OJP funding web page at <http://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm>.

E. Application Review Information

Selection Criteria

1. Statement of the Problem (15%)
2. Project Design and Implementation (30%)
3. Capabilities and Competencies (25%)
4. Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation's Performance Measures (10%)
5. Budget: The budget narrative should thoroughly and clearly describe every category of expense listed in the Budget Detail Worksheet and be complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities). Budget narratives should generally demonstrate how applicants will maximize cost effectiveness of grant expenditures and should demonstrate cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project.¹² (15%)
6. Additional Attachments: Project time; and Position descriptions and resumes for key personnel; (5%)

See Project-Specific Section for additional information.

Review Process

OJP is committed to ensuring a fair and open process for awarding grants. The SMART Office reviews the application to make sure that the information presented is reasonable, understandable, measurable, and achievable, as well as consistent with the solicitation.

Peer reviewers will review the applications submitted under this solicitation that meet basic minimum requirements. For purposes of assessing whether applicants have met basic minimum requirements, OJP screens applications for compliance with specified program requirements to help determine which applications should proceed to further consideration for award. Although program requirements may vary, the following are common requirements applicable to all solicitations for funding under OJP grant programs:

- Applications must be submitted by an eligible type of applicant

¹² Generally speaking, a reasonable cost is a cost that, in its nature or amount, does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the costs.

- Applications must request funding within programmatic funding constraints (if applicable)
- Applications must be responsive to the scope of the solicitation
- Applications must include all items designated as “critical elements”
- Applicants will be checked against the System for Award Management (SAM)

For a list of critical elements, see “What an Application Should Include” under [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

The SMART Office may use internal peer reviewers, external peer reviewers, or a combination, to assess applications meeting basic minimum requirements on technical merit using the solicitation’s selection criteria. An external peer reviewer is an expert in the subject matter of a given solicitation who is not a current DOJ employee. An internal reviewer is a current DOJ employee who is well-versed or has expertise in the subject matter of this solicitation. A peer review panel will evaluate, score, and rate applications that meet basic minimum requirements. Peer reviewers’ ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only, although their views are considered carefully. In addition to peer review ratings, considerations for award recommendations and decisions may include, but are not limited to, underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, past performance under prior SMART Office and OJP awards, and available funding.

OJP reviews applications for potential discretionary awards to evaluate the risks posed by applicants before they receive an award. This review may include but is not limited to the following:

1. Financial stability and fiscal integrity
2. Quality of management systems and ability to meet the management standards prescribed in the Financial Guide
3. History of performance
4. Reports and findings from audits
5. The applicant's ability to effectively implement statutory, regulatory, or other requirements imposed on award recipients
6. Proposed costs to determine if the Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative accurately explain project costs, and whether those costs are reasonable, necessary, and allowable under applicable federal cost principles and agency regulations

Absent explicit statutory authorization or written delegation of authority to the contrary, all final award decisions will be made by the Assistant Attorney General, who may consider factors including, but not limited to, peer review ratings, underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, past performance under prior SMART Office and OJP awards, and available funding when making awards.

F. Federal Award Administration Information

Federal Award Notices

OJP sends award notification by email through GMS to the individuals listed in the application as the point of contact and the authorizing official (E-Biz POC and AOR). The email notification includes detailed instructions on how to access and view the award documents, and how to accept the award in GMS. GMS automatically issues the notifications at 9:00 p.m. eastern time on the award date (by September 30, 2016). Recipients will be required to log in; accept any

outstanding assurances and certifications on the award; designate a financial point of contact; and review, sign, and accept the award. The award acceptance process involves physical signature of the award document by the authorized representative and the scanning of the fully-executed award document to OJP.

Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements

If selected for funding, in addition to implementing the funded project consistent with the agency-approved project proposal and budget, the recipient must comply with award terms and conditions, and other legal requirements, including but not limited to OMB, DOJ or other federal regulations which will be included in the award, incorporated into the award by reference, or are otherwise applicable to the award. OJP strongly encourages prospective applicants to review the information pertaining to these requirements **prior** to submitting an application. To assist applicants and recipients in accessing and reviewing this information, OJP has placed pertinent information on its [Solicitation Requirements](#) page of the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

Please note in particular the following two forms, which applicants must accept in GMS prior to the receipt of any award funds, as each details legal requirements with which applicants must provide specific assurances and certifications of compliance. Applicants may view these forms in the Apply section of the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#) and are strongly encouraged to review and consider them carefully prior to making an application for OJP grant funds.

- [Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements](#)
- [Standard Assurances](#)

Upon grant approval, OJP electronically transmits (via GMS) the award document to the prospective award recipient. In addition to other award information, the award document contains award terms and conditions that specify national policy requirements¹³ with which recipients of federal funding must comply; uniform administrative requirements, cost principles, and audit requirements; and program-specific terms and conditions required based on applicable program (statutory) authority or requirements set forth in OJP solicitations and program announcements, and other requirements which may be attached to appropriated funding. For example, certain efforts may call for special requirements, terms, or conditions relating to intellectual property, data/information-sharing or -access, or information security; or audit requirements, expenditures and milestones, or publications and/or press releases. OJP also may place additional terms and conditions on an award based on its risk assessment of the applicant, or for other reasons it determines necessary to fulfill the goals and objectives of the program.

Prospective applicants may access and review the text of mandatory conditions OJP includes in all OJP awards, as well as the text of certain other conditions, such as administrative conditions, via [Mandatory Award Terms and Conditions](#) page of the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

As stated above, the SMART Office anticipates that it will make any award from this solicitation in the form of a cooperative agreement. Cooperative agreement awards include standard “federal involvement” conditions that describe the general allocation of responsibility for

¹³ See *generally* 2 C.F.R. 200.300 (provides a general description of national policy requirements typically applicable to recipients of Federal awards, including the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (FFATA)).

execution of the funded program. Generally stated, under cooperative agreement awards, responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the funded project rests with the recipient in implementing the funded and approved proposal and budget, and the award terms and conditions. Responsibility for oversight and redirection of the project, if necessary, rests with the SMART Office.

In addition to any “federal involvement” condition(s), OJP cooperative agreement awards include a special condition specifying certain reporting requirements required in connection with conferences, meetings, retreats, seminars, symposium, training activities, or similar events funded under the award, consistent with OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting.

General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements

Recipients must submit quarterly financial reports, semi-annual progress reports, final financial and progress reports, and, if applicable, an annual audit report in accordance with the Part 200 Uniform Requirements. Future awards and fund drawdowns may be withheld if reports are delinquent.

Special Reporting requirements may be required by OJP depending on the statutory, legislative or administrative obligations of the recipient or the program.

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)

For Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s), see title page.

For contact information for Grants.gov, see title page.

H. Other Information

Provide Feedback to OJP

To assist OJP in improving its application and award processes, we encourage applicants to provide feedback on this solicitation, the application submission process, and/or the application review/peer review process. Provide feedback to OJPSolicitationFeedback@usdoj.gov.

IMPORTANT: This email is for feedback and suggestions only. Replies are **not** sent from this mailbox. If you have specific questions on any program or technical aspect of the solicitation, **you must** directly contact the appropriate number or email listed on the front of this solicitation document. These contacts are provided to help ensure that you can directly reach an individual who can address your specific questions in a timely manner.

If you are interested in being a reviewer for other OJP grant applications, please email your résumé to ojppeerreview@lmsolas.com. The OJP Solicitation Feedback email account will not forward your résumé. **Note:** Neither you nor anyone else from your organization can be a peer reviewer in a competition in which you or your organization have submitted an application.

Application Checklist

SMART FY 16 Promoting Evidence Integration in Sex Offender Management: Development and Implementation of Sex Offender Treatment Standards

This application checklist has been created to assist in developing an application.

What an Applicant Should Do:

Prior to Registering in Grants.gov:

- _____ Acquire a DUNS Number (see page 23)
- _____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 23)

To Register with Grants.gov:

- _____ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 23)
- _____ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 23)

To Find Funding Opportunity:

- _____ Search for the Funding Opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 24)
- _____ Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package (see page 24)
- _____ Sign up for Grants.gov email [notifications](#) (optional) (see page 22)
- _____ Read [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#)
- _____ Read OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting available at [ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm](#) (see page 10)

After Application Submission, Receive Grants.gov Email Notifications That:

- _____ (1) application has been received,
- _____ (2) application has either been successfully validated or rejected with errors (see page 24)

If No Grants.gov Receipt, and Validation or Error Notifications are Received:

- _____ contact the SMART Office regarding experiencing technical difficulties (see page 24)

General Requirements:

- _____ Review the [Solicitation Requirements](#) in the OJP Funding Resource Center.

Scope Requirement:

- _____ The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit(s) of up to \$1,000,000.

Eligibility Requirement:

Eligible applicants are nonprofit organizations and for-profit organizations (including tribal Organizations), individuals, institutions of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education), faith-based organizations, and community organizations and consortiums with demonstrated experience in the treatment, assessment, and management of adults and juveniles who commit sex offenses. For-profit organizations must agree to waive any profits or fees for services.

The SMART Office welcomes applications that involve two or more entities that will carry out the funded Federal award activities; however, one eligible entity must be the applicant and the

other(s) must be proposed as subrecipient(s). The applicant must be the entity with primary responsibility for administering the funding and managing the entire SMART FY 16 Promoting Evidence Integration in Sex Offender Management: Development and Implementation of Sex Offender Treatment Standards. Only one application per lead applicant will be considered; however, a subrecipient may be part of multiple proposals.

The SMART Office may elect to make awards for applications submitted under this solicitation in future fiscal years, dependent on, among other considerations, the merit of the applications and on the availability of funds.

What an Application Should Include:

- _____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 12)
- _____ Project Abstract (see page 12)
- _____ Program Narrative (see page 13)
- _____ Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 17)
- _____ Budget Narrative (see page 17)
- _____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 17)
- _____ Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) (see page 18)
- _____ Applicant Disclosure of High Risk Status (see page 18)
- _____ Additional Attachments (see page 19)
 - _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications (see page 18)
 - _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity (see page 19)
 - _____ Project timeline (see page 21)
 - _____ Position descriptions and resumes for key personnel (see page 21)
- _____ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (see page 21)
- _____ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) (see page 21)
- _____ Employee Compensation Waiver request and justification (if applicable) (see page 10)